

Spiegelman

June 16, 1954

Dear Josh:

I hope you will pardon the long delay in answering your letter of May 19th. This was in part due to the fact that I did not have all the details that you wished. I have since obtained them from Michigan, and I am enclosing a summary copy. In addition, the information I have obtained from Michigan suggests that the Administration is going to delay things so that a decision will not be reached until after the Symposium in July.

There is no point here in discussing some of the fine points which you raised in your letter, I agree with them in principle and they can indeed be very telling arguments in discussions amongst honest intellectuals. They would have very little relevance, however, for Mr. McCarthy.

Sincerely yours,

Sal

"First, about Markel. He was a member of the C.P. from a fairly early age- active in college, but the first action of importance was going to Spain in 1937 while still in college. While in Spain he was on the executive committee of the Lincoln Battalion. In the early forties he was executive secretary of the C.P. in Los Angeles area.

In 1941-2 he joined the Merchant Marine being unable to get into the Air Force or Army. After the war he went to Hopkins for graduate work and while there was only slightly active politically. While doing post-graduate work with Beadle, his only activity was with the "Arts Sciences and Professions". Since coming here in 1950 he has had no activities.

His reasons for decrease in activity were not, he says, due to a change in his political ideas or ideals, but rather to a change in his evaluation of the C.P. He says that he never was a Stalinist in the sense that he believed all was well in Russia. But he was and probably still is a Marxist and hoped that the American intellectuals would be able to take over the party. When it was clear to him that the politicians running the party were not free to think for themselves, he left. I am reporting all of this because it is information that Clem thinks is pertinent for people around here.

When he was approached by the Glady committee, he was told that they knew he was not now a member and if he would cooperate in closed hearings and discuss all associations he would be treated nicely and have no publicity. When this offer was refused, the subpoena was substituted. He refused to testify on the grounds of the 1st and 5th. The motives were (1) unwillingness to cooperate with the committee (2) unwillingness to be an informer. As you know one cannot legally refuse to discuss associates when discussing activities.